



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/589,592	07/05/2007	Nikola Anastasijevic	811842	8644
95402	7590	08/03/2011	EXAMINER	
LEYDIG, VOIT AND MAYER			MENDEZ, ZULMARIAM	
TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900				
180 NORTH STETSON AVENUE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO, IL 60601			1723	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/03/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

chgpatent1@leydig.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/589,592	ANASTASIJEVIC ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	ZULMARIAM MENDEZ	1723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05/13/2011.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5,7,8 and 11-33 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 23-33 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-5,7,8 and 11-22 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>05/26/2011</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

1. In view of applicant's amendment to claim 3, the previous objection has been withdrawn.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The rejections made to claims 4, 5, 11, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph have been withdrawn in view of applicant's amendments.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 1-5, 7, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anastasijevic et al. (US Patent no. 5,679,240) in view of Anastasijevic Nikola (DE 199 40698 – referred to as Nikola hereinafter).

With regard to claims 1, 2, Anastasijevic discloses an electrolytic process and apparatus for electro-winning and electrodepositing copper from an electrolyte solution containing the metal in ionogenic form (abstract; col. 1, lines 5-28), in which the electrolyte is passed through an electrolysis plant comprising at least one electrolytic cell (col. 3, lines 54-65) which in an electrolyte tank (1) for receiving the electrolyte (4) has at least two electrodes (K, A; figure 1) serving as an anode (A) and cathode (K), which are alternately arranged at a distance from each other (col. 2, lines 36-41), wherein during operation of the electrolysis the at least one cathode (K) is immersed into the electrolyte (4; figure 1) over a length of at least 1 meter (col. 1, lines 47-57); the electrodes having a horizontal hanger bar (6; figure 2) with a first end and a second end at the edge of the electrolyte tank (1) used to conduct current from an external DC source to the electrodes (col. 3, lines 58-62) but fails to teach wherein two contact bars are provided, the first end of the hanger bar of the cathodes resting on one of the two contact bars via a two-line contact and the first end of the hanger bar of the anodes resting on the other one of the two contact bars via a two-line contact, the second end of the hanger bar of each electrode resting on an equalizer bar disposed on one of the contact bar..

Nikola discloses an electrolysis plant comprising an electrolyte container (1) wherein the electrodes have a horizontal hanger bar (8) provided with two bus bars (6,

7) arranged at the edge of the container (1; see figure 2), the bus bars (6, 7) have terminals to direct current source to several electrodes immersed in the electrolyte (page 1, paragraph 1; paragraph 8 – under description of figures) and wherein an end of the hanger bar (8) of the electrodes rests on an equalizer bar (8b) which is arranged on one of the two contact bars (6; figures 3 and 4) and electrical conductive element (18) disposed on anode contact bar (7; figure 9). This configuration minimizes the transition resistance for the current flow (page 1, paragraph 5). Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to provide two bus bars in connection with the horizontal hanger bar, as taught by Nikola in the electrolysis plant of Anastasijevic, in order to minimize the current flow resistance.

With regard to claim 3, even though Anastasijevic does not explicitly teach wherein at least one cathode is immersed into the electrolyte with a cross-sectional area of 2 meter<sup>2</sup>, Anastasijevic teaches wherein during electrolysis operation, the at least one cathode is immersed in to the electrolyte over a length of at least 1 meter (col. 1, lines 47-57). Anastasijevic further teaches wherein the associated cathodes may have a corresponding large surface area so that the deposition rate will be improved (col. 1, lines 47-57). Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to immerse a desired/large surface area of the electrodes into the electrolyte, as taught by Anastasijevic, in order to improve the deposition rate and efficiency of the process thereby.

With regard to claim 4, even though Anastasijevic fails to explicitly teach wherein the at least one electrolytic cell has more than 60 cathodes, particularly preferably more

than 100 cathodes, and quite particularly preferably 114 cathodes, Anastasijevic discloses wherein multiple anodes disposed alternately with a plurality of cathodes (figure 1; col. 2, lines 37-41). It is well known in the art to increase the amount of electrodes in an electrolytic cell for the extraction of metal under varying conditions. In addition, it has been held by the court that mere duplication of parts has no patentable significance unless a new and unexpected result is produced. *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CPA 1960).

With regard to claim 5, even though Anastasijevic fails to explicitly teach wherein the electrolysis is performed at a current density of more than  $200\text{A/m}^2$ , particularly preferably between 250 and  $370\text{ A/m}^2$ , Anastasijevic discloses that the process can be operated at high and very high current densities so that the anode can be used for an electrolysis resulting in high metal deposition (col. 1, lines 25-28). Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to adjust the current density according to user's requirements in order to obtain a high metal deposition and increase the efficiency of the process thereby.

With regard to claim 7, Nikola further teaches wherein the contact bars (6, 7) each have an at least substantially trapezoidal indentation (figures 2-4) on which rest the respectively first ends of the hanger bars (8) with a contact surface having at least substantially rectangular cross-section (figures 2-4).

With regard to claims 11-12, Nikola discloses wherein the contact bars (6, 7) are cooled by cooling liquid passing through the bars (6, 7; page 1, paragraph 6).

6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anastasijevic in view of Nikola, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Juric et al. (US Patent no. 2003/0173214).

With regard to claim 8, Anastasijevic discloses wherein for protection against corrosion, the copper carrying bar (6) is surrounded by a titanium sheath (col. 3, lines 60-65) instead of a steel sheath.

Juric teaches an aluminum reduction cell for the production of a metal which includes a plurality of collector bars (21; figure 1; abstract) wherein, for the purpose of controlling current distribution, each collector bar includes a core of relatively high electrical conductivity material, such as copper, and a housing of a more mechanically and chemically resistant material, i.e. steel, than the core material (abstract; paragraphs 12 and 33). This will also improve the spatial current density and therefore the stability of the electrolytic cell (paragraphs 14-15). Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to replace the titanium sheath covering the copper core of the modified Anastasijevic, with a steel sheath, as taught by Juric, because steel is a mechanically and chemically resistant material which along with the high electrical conductive copper core will control the current distribution, improve the spatial current density and therefore the stability of the electrolytic cell.

7. Claims 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anastasijevic in view of Nikola, as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Gensini et al. (US Patent no. 5,651,024).

With regard to claims 13-15, the modified Anastasijevic discloses all of the limitations discussed above but fails to teach wherein the water is passed through the cooling water channel in a turbulent flow, wherein the contact bars to be cooled have two separate cooling circuits, one of which (primary circuit) is at least partly provided in the contact bars to be cooled, an which are both connected with each other by a heat exchanger and wherein the primary circuit is fed with purified water and the second cooling circuit is fed with crude water.

Gensini discloses a cooling mechanism comprising a contact rod made of copper connected to a steel electrode so as to form a copper-steel structure (col. 2, line 56 to col. 3, line 2), the copper cooling means consist of a plurality of annular columns or spiral elements starting from a strongly cooled common base, the common base includes a heat exchanger means of high efficiency (col. 3, lines 27-31); the cooling system includes a central pipe for the discharge of water and an outer annular pipe to feed water (col. 5, lines 16-20) in which the cooling water follows an obligatory path so as to increase the heat exchange surfaces between the cooling system and the copper cooling means (col. 5, lines 21-26; figures 1-3). This configuration improves and increases the efficiency of the cooling action of the device as well as its work life and prevents possible operational accidents (col. 1, lines 14-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a cooling system as taught by Gensini, because it would improve and increase the efficiency of the cooling action of the device as well as its work life and would prevent possible operational accidents. Even though the modified Anastasijevic

fails to explicitly teach wherein the cooling water is passed in a turbulent flow, one having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to modify the velocity of the water passing through the cooling channels in order to obtain different flow regimens, either turbulent or laminar, and increase the efficiency of the heat exchanging process according to user's requirements.

With regard to claims 16 and 17, Anastasijevic discloses wherein the electrolytic cell is provided with a flow distributor through which operation of the cell, electrolyte solution is introduced into the cell (col. 2, lines 55-59; col. 3, lines 53-60), wherein the fluid distributor/inlet (2) is disposed at the lower end of the cell (1) and the fluid is introduced into the cell through the distributor (2) below the lower end of the electrodes (K, A; see figure 1).

8. Claims 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anastasijevic in view of Nikola and Genisini, as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Andersen et al. (US Patent no. 4,098,668).

With regard to claims 18-20, the modified Anastasijevic fails to explicitly teach wherein the fluid distributor consists of two tubes arranged substantially parallel to the longitudinal sides of the electrolytic cell, which at their surface each have one or more fluid outlet holes and whose first ends are each connected with a fluid supply conduit, wherein the fluid distributor has about 1 to 5, particularly preferably about 1 to 2 fluid outlet holes per electrode pair and cell side provided in the cell, whose arrangement is substantially adjusted to the spaces between the electrodes.

Andersen teaches an electrolytic apparatus and process for extraction of metals comprising wherein the fluid distributor consists of two tubes/pipes (24, 25) arranged substantially parallel to the longitudinal sides of the electrolytic cell (figures 1, 6 and 8), which at their surface each have one or more fluid outlet holes (27 and 26, respectively) and whose first ends are each connected with a fluid supply conduit (19; figure 1; col. 3, lines 42-45), wherein the fluid distributor has at least one outlet hole having a diameter in the range of 1.59 to 12.7 mm (col. 4, lines 53-57) per electrode pair and cell side provided in the cell (figures 5 and 7), whose arrangement is substantially adjusted to the spaces between the electrodes to avoid turbulence (col. 3, lines 45-49). This configuration provides a process and apparatus by which pure metal may be extracted in a simple, efficient and yet extremely economic manner (col. 2, lines 8-12). Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to modify the fluid distributor in the electrolytic cell of the modified Anastasijevic, as taught by Andersen, in order to provide a process and apparatus by which pure metal may be extracted in a simple, efficient and yet extremely economic manner.

With regard to claim 21, Andersen further teaches wherein the electrolytic cell has two electrolyte outlets (23, 15; figure 1).

9. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anastasijevic in view of Nikola and Genisini, as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Hiai et al. (US Patent no. 5,865,967).

With regard to claim 22, even though the modified Anastasijevic fails to explicitly teach wherein the cathodes have an indentation of V-shaped cross-section at their lower longitudinal edge, it is well known in the art to modify the shape of the electrodes for the extraction of metal under varying conditions, as taught by Andersen (col. 2, line 66 to col. 3, line 1) and evidenced by Hiai.

Hiai discloses a method and apparatus for electrowinning metals (abstract) wherein the electrode may have an indentation of V-shaped cross-section at their lower longitudinal edge in order to enable easy peeling of the precipitated metal from the cathode plate and improves the shielding performance of the insulator against the electrolytic precipitation (col. 1, lines 37-58). Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to modify the shape of the cathode, as taught by Hiai, in the electrolytic cell of the modified Anastasijevic, in order to enable easy peeling of the precipitated metal from the cathode plate and improves the shielding performance of the insulator against the electrolytic precipitation. In addition, it has been held that the configuration or shape of a claimed device is a matter of choice which a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found obvious absent persuasive evidence that the particular configuration of the claimed device is significant. *In re Dailey*, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966).

### ***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant's arguments filed on May 13, 2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that the Prior Art made of record fails to teach

or suggest distributing current between the anode and cathode; resting a second end of the hanger bars on respective equalizer bars disposed on one of the contact bars, as required by amended claim 1. The blocks (8b) of Nikola is at the first end of the support bars (8) and merely serve to conduct current from one of the bus bars (6, 7) to the support bar (8).

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. According to the present invention, equalizers are electrical conducting elements arranged in one end of the contact bar in such a way that the distribution of current between the electrodes is rendered more uniform. This is expedient in particular with high specific current intensities, in order to minimize the transfer resistances and electric losses (paragraph 0017 of Patent Application Publication). As discussed above, Nikola discloses an electrolysis plant comprising an electrolyte container (1) wherein the electrodes have a horizontal hanger bar (8) provided with two bus bars (6, 7) arranged at the edge of the container (1; see figure 2), the bus bars (6, 7) have terminals to direct current source to several electrodes immersed in the electrolyte (page 1, paragraph 1; paragraph 8 – under description of figures); resting an end of the hanger bars (8) on respective electrical conducting elements/equalizers (8b, figures 3 and 4) disposed on cathode contact bars (6) and electrical conductive element (18) disposed on anode contact bar (7; figure 9) in order to minimize the transition resistance for the current flow (page 1, paragraph 5).

***Conclusion***

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).
12. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.
13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ZULMARIAM MENDEZ whose telephone number is (571)272-9805. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9am to 5pm.
14. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexa Neckel can be reached on 571-272-1446. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

15. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Harry D Wilkins, III/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1723

/Z. M./  
Examiner, Art Unit 1723